

THE "ENTOMOLOGICAL MUDDLE" — A REJOINDER. LY THE REV. THOMAS W. FYLES, SOUTH QUEBEC.

I thought I had "said my say" on the Cunea-Congrua question, but Mr. Lyman's attack upon me demands a reply.

Mr. Lyman has made a military allusion in rather questionable taste. I would remind him that the reason the Boers have *stuck to their* guns is that, until now (May, 1900), their opponents have not been able to capture their guns, but have, on the other hand, furnished the Boers with new artillery and fresh stores of ammunition.

Mr. Lyman has supplied me with new proofs that *cunea*, Drury, and *punctatissima*, S. & A., are not identical—proofs that I think will be convincing to every candid reader. I shall set them forth in due course.

I will arrange the remarks I have now to offer as I did those which I made in the March number of this year's ENTOMOLOGIST.

I .- Concerning the identity of congrua, Walker, with antigone, Strecker.

Mr. Lyman thinks it probable that I am right in maintaining that *antigone*, Strecker, is only a synonym of *congrua*, Walker; but he thinks also that two clauses in my summary of evidence brought before us—viz.:

(c) Dr. Hulst and others have bred it.

(d) S. antigone has been found to be identical with it — "too positive to be scientific." Why? Dr. Hulst described the larvæ under the name of *congrua*, and the larvæ I raised were unquestionably of the same kind as his, and these produced moths which tally in every particular with the description given by Grote and Robinson (see description on page 123 of the May number), several of them having the S-like mark